

REMARKS

An editing error in claim 18 is corrected above.

The applicant finds no basis for a combination of the Olson '757 patent or the like to a bolt and the Rieschick patent or the like to a nut. "Nuts and bolts" may be common English phrase, but the meaning is of a collection of things, like "bits and pieces," and not an implication of motivation to transfer disclosure from one to the other. In fact, in technology, they are opposites, female and male, and this opposite understanding of those of ordinary skill in the art is what should control combining the technology in rejection of a patent application.


Further, it is usual and is the case in the Olson '757 and Rieschick patent that the thread length to head diameter is much longer in the Olson '757 patent. This teaches more pulling power to the Olson '757 patent from the longer thread and, thus, teaches toward forcing the bulge as in claim 18 in a way that the Rieschick patent does not.

The editorial correction of claim 18 above confirms the same reasons for not combining these references. Because the strength of a nut as in the Rieschick patent is in its annular thickness (the difference of external and internal diameters) it might be expected that the total area of its planar portions would be larger than the total area of its locking recesses, but this is not the case with a bolt as of the Olson '757 patent. In a bolt, its strength is in its central threaded shank and the projection of the shank into its head. Its planar portions are small, it not being unknown in practice to sink a head into its bolted object or bend up or even shear off its head. With the relatively smaller planar portions, those of ordinary skill in the bolt art would make the area of the locking recesses larger than the other planar area so as to maximize the locking function, in contrast to the opposite teaching of claim 18.

The bolt of claim 18, on which the external thread is formed so as to mate with an internal thread already formed in a member to be mated as disclosed in the specification and now claimed is different from the tapping screw of the Olson '757 patent and like references previously considered. Even though the term "machine screw" cannot be used as determined in previous Actions, the absence of this short-hand term does not change the distinction now claimed by the cylindrical threaded part and the mating with an internal thread of the lockable member. In the Olson '757 patent, the lockable member does not have an internal thread. Instead, the tapping screw makes a thread in the lockable member. Claim 18 mates a thread, the Olson '757 patent makes (forces) a thread, a difference well understood between marriage and police blotters by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930